



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,969	10/25/2001	Cynthia K. Schilling	10006627-2	1054

7590 06/20/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/032,969

Applicant(s)

SCHILLING ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua Joo

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 8-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Godlew et al, US Patent #5,377,196 (Godlew hereinafter).

4. As per claims 1, 10, and 19, Godlew teaches the invention as claimed including the method and apparatus for diagnosing a data communication network. Godlew's teachings comprise of:

executing a first program on at least one portion of said electronic network (Col 9, lines 15-17. Monitoring collects network data.);

receiving first data resulting from the execution of said first program (Col 9, lines 15-17. Monitoring collects network data.);

analyzing said first data to determine if said at least one portion of said network is not operating within a preselected specification (Col 9, lines 16-17. Determines problem. Col 8, lines 7-11. Collects data to verify problem. Col 7, lines 52-53. Problem includes conditions that exceed a predefined threshold.);

executing a second program on said at least one portion of said electronic network if the analysis of said first data indicates that said at least one portion of said

Art Unit: 2154

electronic network is not operating within said preselected level (Col 9, lines 18-20.

Network is further monitored to collect additional data to confirm network problem.)

receiving second data resulting first the execution of said second program (Col 9, lines 18-20. Network is further monitored to collect additional data to confirm network problem.); and

analyzing said first data and second data to determine the cause of said at least one portion of said network not operating within said preselected specification (Col 9, lines 6-14. Collected data is used to diagnose the network problem.)

5. As per claims 2 and 11, Godlew teaches the invention of claims 1 and 10, wherein said executing a first program comprises measuring the latency associated with said at least one portion of said electronic network (Col 17, lines 22-27. Parameters used to monitor network includes traffic rate.).

6. As per claims 3 and 12, Godlew teaches the invention of claims 1 and 10, wherein said at least one portion of said network has a connector associated therewith, said connector storing a management information base, and wherein said executing a first program comprises measuring data stored in said management information base (Fig. 1. Expert system is connected to the network. Col 17, lines 17-28. Expert system contains information regarding baseline and nominal conditions, which are used to identify network problems.).

7. As per claims 8 and 17, Godlew teaches the inventions of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising displaying a graphical user interface representative of said network, said graphical user interface indicating said portion of said network not operating within

Art Unit: 2154

said preselected application (Col 31, lines 38-53. Fig. 16. User interface displays network problems, and all events are displayed on the interface.).

8. As per claims 9 and 18, Godlew teaches the method of claims 8 and 17, wherein said graphical user interface further displays information relating to at least one cause of said network not operating within said preselected specification (Col 31, lines 38-53. Fig. 16. User interface displays network problems including a hypothesis window for hypothesized network problems and events that are send to the events log. Col 31, lines 20-22. Explanation window contains responses to operator's explanations requests.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4, 6-7, 13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godlew in view of Sin et al, US Publication #2002/0051464 (Sin hereinafter).

Art Unit: 2154

11. As per claims 4, 6-7, 13 and 15-16, Godlew teaches of collecting two network data by monitoring the network and using the collected network data to determine the network problem (Col 9, lines 15-20).

12. However, Godlew does not specifically teach the invention, wherein said executing said first program comprises running a trace route routine at first time and a second time on said at least a portion of said network, said trace route routine measuring the latency of said at least one portion of said network, said first data corresponding to the difference between the latency measured said first time and said second time said trace routine is run.

13. Sin teaches of monitoring the quality of service by running a trace route and comparing the results of the trace route with historical values (Paragraph 0032; 0142).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Godlew and Sin because both teachings deal with the monitoring of quality of service over a communications network and comparing collected values with stored parameters. Furthermore, the teachings of Sin to run a trace route and compare the results with historical values would enhance the system of Godlew's teachings because trace routes are useful in determining the topology of the network by calculating the number of hops, which can be used to identify network problems. Also, comparing the values would allow for an improved method of diagnosing the network by determining if the results of the trace route exceed a predetermined threshold.

Art Unit: 2154

15. Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godlew in view of Waclawsky et al, US Patent #5,974,457 (Waclawsky hereinafter).

16. As per claims 5 and 14, Godlew does not teach the invention of claims 1 and 10, wherein said first program stores correlations between previous network conditions and previous network problems, and wherein said executing a first program comprises comparing present network conditions to stored network conditions and determining a network problem based at least in part on the comparison

17. Waclawsky teaches of storing benchmark data sets, which provide a history of network activity, which can be used to determine whether the network exceeds or will exceed some criteria that indicate performance problems (Col 8, lines 31-39). The criteria modules are responsible for evaluating the current monitored data from against the prior collected benchmark data (Col 7 lines 56-64). Alerts and logs of information are sent to the expert system to correct the network problem (Col 7, line 61- Col 8, line 6.).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Godlew and Waclawsky because both teachings deal with using an expert system to monitor the communications network. Furthermore, the teachings of Waclawsky to store a history of the network activities and using the stored information to compare with the present conditions to determine network problems would enhance the expert system of Godlew's teachings by improving the capability in analyzing and diagnosing the problems of the network.

Art Unit: 2154

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 10, and 19 under *Waclawsky* have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of *Godlew*.

Conclusion

20. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on 571 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


23. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 2154

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 9, 2005

JJ



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100